arXiv:math/0702175v2 [math.PR] 4 Apr 2007

DIFFERENCE APPROXIMATION FOR LOCAL TIMES OF MULTIDIMENSIONAL DIFFUSIONS

ALEXEY M. KULIK

Abstract. We consider sequences of additive functionals of difference approximations for uniformly non-degenerate multidimensional diffusions. The conditions are given, sufficient for such a sequence to converge weakly to a W-functional of the limiting process. The class of the W-functionals, that can be obtained as the limiting ones, is completely described in the terms of the associated W-measures μ by the condition

$$\lim_{\delta\downarrow 0}\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^m}\int_{\|y-x\|\leq\delta} w(\|y-x\|)\mu(dy)=0,\qquad w(r)\equiv\begin{cases}\max(-\ln r,1), & m=2\\ r^{2-m}, & m>2.\end{cases}$$

1. Introduction

In the paper, we consider an $\mathbb{R}^m$-valued diffusion process X defined by an SDE

$$X(t)=X(0)+\int_0^t a(X(s))\,ds+\int_0^t b(X(s))\,dW(s),\quad t\in\mathbb{R}^+, \tag{1.1}$$

and a sequence of processes $X_n, n\geq 1$, with their values at the time moments $\frac{k}{n}, k\in\mathbb{N}$ given by a difference relation

$$X_n\left(\frac{k}{n}\right)=X_n\left(\frac{k-1}{n}\right)+a\left(X_n\left(\frac{k-1}{n}\right)\right)\cdot\frac{1}{n}+b\left(X_n\left(\frac{k-1}{n}\right)\right)\cdot\frac{\xi_k}{\sqrt{n}}, \tag{1.2}$$

and, at all the other time moments, defined in a piece-wise linear way:

$$X_n(t)=X_n\left(\frac{k-1}{n}\right)+(nt-k+1)\left[X_n\left(\frac{k}{n}\right)-X_n\left(\frac{k-1}{n}\right)\right],\quad t\in\left[\frac{k-1}{n},\frac{k}{n}\right). \tag{1.3}$$

Here and below, W is a Wiener process valued in $\mathbb{R}^m$, $\{\xi_k\}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. random vectors in $\mathbb{R}^m$, that belong to the domain of attraction of the normal law, are centered and have the identity for covariance matrix. Under standard assumptions about coefficients of the equations (1.1), (1.2) (local Lipschitz condition and linear growth condition), the distributions of the processes X_n in $C(\mathbb{R}^+,\mathbb{R}^m)$ with the given initial value $X_n(0)=x$ converge weakly to the distribution of the process X with $X(0)=x$ (see [1]).

In the paper, we deal with the following problem. Let $\{\varphi^{s,t}, 0\leq s\leq t\}$ be a W-functional of the diffusion process defined by (1.1). This, by definition, means that (see [2], Chapter 6) φ is a non-negative homogeneous additive functional with its characteristics

$$\{f^t(x)\equiv E[\varphi^{0,t}|X(0)=x], t\geq 0, x\in\mathbb{R}^m\}$$

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60J55, 60J45, 60F17.

Key words and phrases. Additive functional, local time, characteristics, W-measure, Markov approximation.

The research was partially supported by the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine, project N GP/F13/0095.

satisfying the condition $\sup_x f^t(x) < +\infty, t \in \mathbb{R}^+$. We consider a sequence of non-negative additive functionals $\{\varphi_n^{s,t}, 0 \le s \le t\}, n \ge 1$ of the processes X_n, of the form

$$\varphi_n^{s,t} = \varphi_n^{s,t}(X_n) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k:s\le\frac{k}{n}<t} F_n\left(X_n\left(\frac{k}{n}\right)\right), \quad 0 \le s < t, \tag{1.4}$$

and give the conditions sufficient for the joint distributions of (φ_n, X_n), conditioned by $X_n(0) = x$ ($x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is an arbitrary point), to converge weakly to the joint distribution of (φ, X), conditioned by $X(0) = x$.

One motivation for posing such a problem is the following one. It is well known that the theory of additive functionals of $\mathbb{R}^m$-valued Markov processes is closely related with the potential theory. There exists a one-to-one correspondence between W-functionals and so called W-measures (see [2], Chapter 8); every W-functional φ can be written at the form

$$\varphi^{s,t} = \int_s^t \frac{d\mu}{d\lambda^m}(X(r))\, dr, \quad 0 \le s \le t, \tag{1.5}$$

where μ is the corresponding W-measure, λ^m is the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^m$. In general, W-measure μ is not absolutely continuous w.r.t. λ^m; for singular μ equality (1.5) is a formal notation, that can be substantiated via an approximative procedure with μ approximated by an absolutely continuous measures. The functional φ, given by (1.5), is called the local time of the process X, corresponding to the measure μ.

Given W-functional φ, one can construct the sub-process X^φ with its transition probability given by

$$P[X^\varphi(t) \in \Gamma | X^\varphi(0) = x] = E[\mathbf{1}_\Gamma(X(t)) \cdot \exp(-\varphi^{0,t}) | X(0) = x], \quad t \in \mathbb{R}^+, x \in \mathbb{R}^m, \Gamma \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{R}^m) \tag{1.6}$$

(see [2], §6 of Introduction); the measure μ is interpreted as the *killing measure* for this process. Let X be the diffusion process given by the equation (1.1), then its generator is equal

$$\mathfrak{A} = \sum_{i=1}^m a_i \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^m \sigma_{ij} \cdot \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}, \quad \sigma \equiv (\sigma_{ij})_{i,j=1}^m = bb^*.$$

The well known Feynman-Kac formula gives the generator of the process X^φ at the form $\mathfrak{A}^\varphi f = \mathfrak{A} f - \frac{d\mu}{d\lambda^m} \cdot f$, i.e., for every continuous bounded function $g(\cdot)$, the solution to the following Cauchy problem for the second order parabolic PDE

$$u_t'(t,x) = \sum_{i=1}^m a_i \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} u(t,x) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^m \sigma_{ij} \cdot \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} u(t,x) - \frac{d\mu}{d\lambda^m}(x) u(t,x), \quad u(0,x) = g(x) \tag{1.7}$$

has the following probabilistic representation:

$$u(t,x) = E[g(X(t)) \cdot \exp(-\varphi^{0,t}) | X(0) = x]. \tag{1.8}$$

Let us note that the term $\frac{d\mu}{d\lambda^m}$ in the equation (1.7), that corresponds to the "heat flow-out", is a generalized function and equation (1.7) should be interpreted in the generalized sense (therefore, it is natural to call this equation a singular one). On the other hand, its solution is a bounded measurable function due to the representation (1.8).

Put

$$u_n(t,x) = E[g(X_n(t)) \cdot \exp(-\varphi_n^{0,t})|X_n(0) = x]. \tag{1.9}$$

The main result of the present paper (Theorem 2.1) provides convergence in distribution of the difference approximation $(\varphi_n, X_n,)$ to (φ, X); thus, under conditions of this theorem,

$$u_n(t,x) \to u(t,x), \quad n \to \infty, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}^+, x \in \mathbb{R}^m.$$

This means that this theorem, in particular, gives an opportunity to apply, in a standard way, the Monte-Carlo method for numerical solution of the Cauchy problem for the singular parabolic equation (1.7).

Let us make a short overview of the bibliography devoted to weak convergence of the functionals of the type (1.4). For one-dimensional random walks and difference approximations of one-dimensional diffusions, there exists a large variety of limit theorems for the associated additive functionals. We do not discuss these results in details, since we are mostly interested in a multidimensional case, and refer to the monographs [3],[4] and papers [5] – [10].

In the multidimensional case the situation is essentially different. The author does not know any paper where a limit theorem for the functionals of the type (1.4) would be proved in the case where X_n approximate a non-additive diffusion process X (i.e, where the coefficients a, b are non-constant). The only multidimensional limit theorem, known for the author, for the additive functionals of the type (1.4), is given in the paper [11] in the situation where X_n is a multidimensional aperiodic lattice random walk and X is the Brownian motion in $\mathbb{R}^m$ (also, the paper [12] deals with the closely related problems). The significant difference between the results available in the one- and multidimensional cases can be naturally explained by the fact that the structure of the class of W-measures is much more complicated in the second case than in the first one. For the Brownian motion (and, also, for any non-degenerate diffusion), for $m = 1$, every finite measure is a W-measure. For $m > 1$, any measure $\delta_z, z \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is not a W-measure ($\Leftrightarrow$ there does not exists the local time at any fixed point $\Leftrightarrow$ every one-point set has its capacity equal to zero $\Leftrightarrow$ every one-point set is a polar set). Therefore, in the case $m \geq 2$, the claims both on the "symbols" $\frac{d\mu_n}{d\lambda^m} \equiv F_n$ of the approximating aggregates (1.4) and on the "symbol" $\frac{d\mu}{d\lambda^m}$ of the limiting functional φ should be more delicate. In the paper [11], the uniform (w.r.t. n) analogue of the following "dimensional" condition on the symbol $\frac{d\mu}{d\lambda^m}$ was used:

$$\exists\, C \in \mathbb{R}^+, \gamma > m-2 : \quad \mu(\{y | \|y-x\| \leq r\}) \leq Cr^\gamma, \quad r \geq 0. \tag{1.10}$$

For the Brownian motion in $\mathbb{R}^m$, the following criterium is well known ([2], Chapter 8): measure μ is a W-measure iff

$$\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^m} \int_{\|y-x\|\leq 1} w(\|y-x\|)\mu(dy) < +\infty, \tag{1.11}$$

$$w(r) \equiv \begin{cases} \max(-\ln r, 1), & m = 2 \\ r^{2-m}, & m > 2. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to verify that the condition (1.10) is sufficient for the condition (1.11) to hold true. However, it is not a necessary one (see Example 5.1). This, in particular, means that in the main limit theorem of [11] only the functionals from some proper subclass of the class of W-functionals (namely, the functionals with their W-measures satisfying the "dimensional" condition (1.10)) can be obtained as a limiting ones.

The main result of the present paper (Theorem 2.1) establishes the weak convergence of the functionals (1.4) for difference approximations X_n of multidimensional uniformly non-degenerate diffusions X. In our framework, the class of the difference approximations X_n is wide enough. We claim the densities of the transition probabilities for X_n to satisfy a proper version of the local limit theorem (property B4), Chapter 4 below). We rely on the results of the papers [13], [14] while giving conditions, sufficient for such a claim.

The condition, imposed in Theorem 2.1 on the "symbols" of the approximating aggregates, is the uniform (w.r.t. n) analogue of the condition

$$\lim_{\delta\downarrow 0}\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^m}\int_{\|y-x\|\le\delta} w(\|y-x\|)\mu(dy)=0. \tag{1.12}$$

Condition (1.10) is sufficient, but not necessary one for the condition (1.12) to hold true (see Example 5.1). Let us discuss the relation between conditions (1.12) and (1.11) in a more details. In the present paper, in order to make exposition more short and transparent, we consider the measures μ with a compact supports, only. For such a measure, using the standard estimate for the transition density of a non-degenerate diffusion (see [2], Appendix, §6 and references there), one can check, in a standard way, that the condition (1.11) is also the necessary and sufficient condition for a measure μ to be a W-measure for uniformly non-degenerate diffusion. The condition (1.12) is clarified by the following statement.

Proposition 1.1. *Let X be a diffusion process, valued in $\mathbb{R}^m, m\ge 2$, with its coefficients satisfying condition A1) of Theorem 2.1, given below. Let μ be a W-measure with a compact support, φ be the W-functional, corresponding to this measure and f be its characteristics. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

(i) for any $t\in\mathbb{R}^+$, the function $f^t(\cdot)$ is uniformly continuous on $\mathbb{R}^m$;

(ii) $\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^m} f^\delta(x)\to 0$, $\delta\downarrow 0$;

(ii) μ satisfies the condition (1.12);

We prove Proposition 1.1 in the Chapter 4. One can interpret the statement of this Proposition in the following way: any W-measure, satisfying (1.12), correspond to the W-functional that is regular w.r.t. the phase variable. The class of functionals, that can be obtained as the limit ones in the context of the main result the present paper (Theorem 2.1), exactly coincides with the class of the functionals, regular w.r.t. the phase variable in a sense given by Proposition 1.1 (see Remark 2.3).

2. The main statement

We consider the objects, given by (1.1) – (1.4), for $m\ge 2$. We use notation $\|\cdot\|$ for the Euclidean norm, not indicating explicitly the space this norm is written for. The classes of functions, that have k continuous derivatives, and functions, that are continuous and bounded together with their k derivatives, are denoted by C^k and C^k_b, correspondingly. The derivative (the gradient) is denoted by ∇. The weak convergence of the (not necessary probability) measures μ_n to μ means, by the definition, convergence $\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f\,d\mu_n\to\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f\,d\mu_n$ for every $f\in C_b(\mathbb{R}^m)$.

Let us formulate the main conditions on the objects involved to (1.1) – (1.4).

A1) $a \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^m), b \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^{m\times m})$ and there exist positive constants c, C such that

$$c\|\theta\|^2 \le (b(x)b^*(x)\theta, \theta)_{\mathbb{R}^m} \le C\|\theta\|^2, \quad x, \theta \in \mathbb{R}^m.$$

Furthermore, the function $\nabla^2 b$ satisfies the Hölder condition with some positive exponent.

A2) I.i.d. random vectors $\{\xi_k\}$ are centered and have the identity for covariance matrix.

A3) Random vectors $\{\xi_k\}$ possess the distribution density $p \in C^4(\mathbb{R}^m)$. There exists a function $\psi : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^+$ such that

$$\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^m} \psi(x) < +\infty, \qquad \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \|x\|^{m^2+2m+4}\psi(x)\,dx < +\infty$$

and

$$\|[\nabla^i p](x)\| \le \psi(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^m, \quad i = 0, \dots, 4.$$

A4) $F_n(x) \ge 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^m, n \ge 1$ and $\frac{1}{n} \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^m} F_n(x) \to 0, n \to \infty$.

A5) Measures $\mu_n(dx) \equiv F_n(x)\lambda^m(dx)$ weakly converge to the finite measure μ, that has a compact support.

A6) The following uniform analogue of the condition (1.12) holds true:

$$\lim_{\delta\downarrow 0} \limsup_{n\to+\infty} \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^m} \int_{\|y-x\|\le\delta} w(\|y-x\|)\mu_n(dy) \to 0.$$

Remark 2.1. If conditions A5) and A6) hold true, then the measure μ satisfies condition (1.12). In particular, μ is a W-measure.

Remark 2.2. The function $w(\cdot)$ is bounded on $[\delta, +\infty)$ for any given $\delta > 0$. Thus, conditions A5) and A6) imply that $\limsup_n \mu_n(\mathbb{R}^m) < +\infty$ and

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^m} \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} w(\|y-x\|)\mu_n(dy) < +\infty.$$

Let us proceed with the formulation of the main statement. Together with the functionals φ_n, that are piece-wise constant w.r.t. both time variables, we consider the random broken lines, constructed from these functionals:

$$\psi_n^{s,t} = \varphi_n^{\frac{j-1}{n},\frac{k-1}{n}} + (ns-j+1)\varphi_n^{\frac{j-1}{n},\frac{j}{n}} + (nt-k+1)\varphi_n^{\frac{k-1}{n},\frac{k}{n}}, \ s \in \left[\frac{j-1}{n}, \frac{j}{n}\right), t \in \left[\frac{k-1}{n}, \frac{k}{n}\right).$$

We interpret the random broken lines ψ_n as the random elements, taking values in $C(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R}^+)$, where $\mathbb{T} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{(s,t) | 0 \le s \le t\}$. The W-functional $\varphi = \varphi(X)$ of the process X we define by the formula (1.5) (the measure μ is taken from the condition A5)).

Theorem 2.1. *Let the conditions A1) – A6) hold. Then* $(X_n, \psi_n(X_n)) \Rightarrow (X, \varphi(X))$ *in a sense of weak convergence in* $C(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{R}^m) \times C(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R}^+)$.

We prove Theorem 2.1 in the Chapter 4.

Remark 2.3. Let an arbitrary W-measure μ, satisfying condition (1.12), be given. Then one can construct a sequence of the functions $\{F_n\}$ in such a way that conditions A4)-A6) hold true. For instance, one can define F_n by

$$F_n(x) = n \cdot \int_0^{\frac{1}{n}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} q_t(x,y)\mu(dy)\,dt, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^m,$$

where $q_t(x,y) = (2\pi t)^{-\frac{m}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{\|y-x\|^2}{2}\right)$ is the transition probability density for the Brownian motion W. Then $\frac{1}{n}F_n$ is equal to the value at the point $\frac{1}{n}$ of the characteristics of the W-functional of the process W,

$$L_t = \int_0^t \frac{d\mu}{d\lambda^m}(W_s)\,ds,$$

and the properties A4)-A6) can be proved analogously to the proof of Proposition 1.1 (see Chapter 4).

3. Weak convergence of additive functionals of a sequence of Markov chains

Our proof of Theorem 2.1 is based on the general theorem on convergence in distribution of a sequence of additive functionals of Markov chains, given in the paper [15]. In this chapter, we give a detailed exposition of the objects and auxiliary notions, that are used in this theorem.

In this chapter we suppose that the processes $X_n(\cdot), X(\cdot)$ are defined $\mathbb{R}^+$ and take their values in a locally compact metric space $(\mathfrak{X}, \rho)$. We say that the process X possesses the Markov property at the time moment $s \in \mathbb{R}^+$ w.r.t. filtration $\{\mathcal{G}_t, t \in \mathbb{R}^+\}$, if X is adapted with this filtration and for every $k \in \mathbb{N}, t_1, \dots, t_k > s$ there exists a probability kernel $\{P_{st_1\dots t_k}(x, A), x \in \mathfrak{X}, A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{X}^k)\}$ such that

$$E[\mathbf{I}_A((X(t_1), \dots, X(t_k)))|\mathcal{G}_s] = P_{st_1\dots t_k}(X(s), A) \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{X}^k). \tag{3.1}$$

The measure $P_{st_1\dots t_k}(x, \cdot)$ has a natural interpretation as the conditional finite-dimensional distribution of X at the points $t_1, \dots, t_k$ under condition $\{X(s) = x\}$; below, we use notation $P_{st_1\dots t_k}(x, \cdot) = P((X(t_1), \dots, X(t_k)) \in \cdot | X(s) = x)$.

Everywhere below we claim the process X to possess the Markov property w.r.t. its canonical filtration at every $s \in \mathbb{R}^+$, and every processes X_n to possess this property (w.r.t. its canonical filtrations) at the points of the type $\frac{i}{n}, i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$; this means that every process X_n is, in fact, a Markov chain with the time scale, proportional to $\frac{1}{n}$.

Let the additive functionals φ_n be given by the formula (1.4). For the functional φ_n, its characteristics f_n (the analogue of the characteristics of a W-functional) is defined by the formula

$$f_n^{s,t}(x) \overset{\text{def}}{=} E[\varphi_n^{s,t}(X_n)|X_n(s) = x], \quad s = \frac{i}{n}, i \in \mathbb{Z}_+, t > s, x \in \mathfrak{X}. \tag{3.2}$$

Let us note that the process X_n possesses the Markov property w.r.t. its canonical filtration at the points $s = \frac{i}{n}, i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and the functional (1.4) is the function of the values of X_n at the finite family of teh time moments. Therefore the mean value in (3.2) is well defined as the integral w.r.t. family of the conditional finite-dimensional distributions $\{P_{st_1\dots t_k}(x, \cdot), t_1, \dots, t_k > s, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ of the process X_n.

The following result ([15], Theorem 1) is an analogue of the well known theorem by E.B.Dynkin, that describes convergence of W-functionals in the terms of their characteristics ([2], Theorem 6.4).

Theorem 3.1. *Let the sequence of the processes X_n be given, providing Markov approximation for the homogeneous Markov process X (see Definition 3.1 below), and let the sequence $\{\varphi_n \equiv \varphi_n(X_n)\}$ be defined by (1.4). Suppose that the following conditions hold true:*

(1) *The functions $\frac{1}{n}F_n(\cdot)$ are non-negative, bounded on $\mathfrak{X}$ and uniformly converge to zero:*

$$\delta(F_n) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{n}\sup_{x\in\mathfrak{X}} F_n(x) \to 0, \quad n\to\infty.$$

(2) *There exists a function f, that is a characteristics of a certain W-functional $\varphi = \varphi(X)$ of the limiting process X, such that, for every $T\in\mathbb{R}^+$,*

$$\sup_{s=\frac{i}{n}, t\in(s,T)} \sup_{x\in\mathfrak{X}} |f_n^{s,t}(x) - f^{t-s}(x)| \to 0, \quad n\to\infty.$$

(3) *The limiting function f is continuous w.r.t. variable x, locally uniformly w.r.t. time variable, i.e., for every $T\in\mathbb{R}^+$,*

$$\sup_{t\le T}\left|f^t(x) - f^t(y)\right| \to 0, \quad \|x-y\|\to 0.$$

Then, for the random broken lines ψ_n, corresponding to φ_n,

$$\psi_n(X_n) \Rightarrow \varphi(X) \equiv \{\varphi^{s,t}(X), (s,t)\in\mathbb{T}\}$$

in a sense of weak convergence in $C(\mathbb{T},\mathbb{R}^+)$.

If, additionally, $X_n \Rightarrow X \quad C(\mathbb{R}^+,\mathfrak{X})$, then $(X_n,\psi_n(X_n)) \Rightarrow (X,\varphi(X))$ n a sense of weak convergence in $C(\mathbb{R}^+,\mathfrak{X})\times C(\mathbb{T},\mathbb{R}^+)$.

The notion of Markov approximation, introduced in [16], is a key one in Theorem 3.1.

Definition 3.1. The sequence of the processes $\{X_n\}$ provides the Markov approximation for the Markov process X, if for every $\gamma>0, T<+\infty$ there exist a constant $K(\gamma,T)\in\mathbb{N}$ and a sequence of two-component processes $\{\hat{Y}_n = (\hat{X}_n,\hat{X}^n)\}$, possibly defined on another probability space, such that

(i) $\hat{X}_n \overset{d}{=} X_n, \hat{X}^n \overset{d}{=} X$;

(ii) the processes $\hat{Y}_n$,$\hat{X}_n$, $\hat{X}^n$ possess the Markov property at the points $\frac{iK(\gamma,T)}{n}, i\in\mathbb{N}$ w.r.t. the filtration $\{\hat{\mathcal{F}}_t^n = \sigma(\hat{Y}_n(s), s\le t)\}$;

(iii) $\limsup_{n\to+\infty} P\left(\sup_{i\le\frac{Tn}{K(\gamma,T)}} \rho\left(\hat{X}_n\left(\frac{iK(\gamma,T)}{n}\right),\hat{X}^n\left(\frac{iK(\gamma,T)}{n}\right)\right) > \gamma\right) < \gamma$.

The following result, on the one hand, provides an example, that clarifies the given above definition, and, on the other hand, gives the opportunity to apply Theorem 3.1 in order to prove the main statement of the paper.

Lemma 3.1. *Let a, b be bounded and satisfy Lipschitz condition, $m\ge 1$ be arbitrary and i.i.d. random vectors $\{\xi_k\}$ be centered, have the identity for covariance matrix and satisfy condition $E\|\xi_k\|^{2+\delta} < +\infty$ for some $\delta>0$.*

Then the sequence of the processes X_n, given by (1.2),(1.3), provides the Markov approximation for the process X, given by the equation (1.1).

At the Example 3 of the paper [15], the statement of the Lemma was proved with the use of the pathwise uniqueness property of the equation (1.1). The reasonings of such a kind are a qualitative ones, and can not provide explicit estimates for the rate of convergence. Therefore, here we give another straightforward proof, that gives possibility for the further estimates and generalizations.

Proof. We start from the construction, described in the proof of Theorem 1 [16]. Denote $S_N=\sum_{k=1}^N \xi_k$; due to CLT, $n^{-\frac{1}{2}}S_n\Rightarrow W(1)$. Condition $E\|\xi_k\|^{2+\delta}<+\infty$ ensures that the family $\{\frac{S_N^2}{N}\}$ is uniformly integrable, and therefore the Wasserstein distance between the distributions of the vectors $N^{-\frac{1}{2}}S_N$ and $W(1)$ tends to 0 as $N\to\infty$. This means that, for any $\varepsilon>0$, there exist $N_\varepsilon\in\mathbb{N}$ and random vector $(\eta_\varepsilon,\zeta_\varepsilon)$ such that

$$E\|\eta_\varepsilon-\zeta_\varepsilon\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^m}<\varepsilon,\quad \eta_\varepsilon\overset{df}{=}\frac{S_{N_\varepsilon}}{\sqrt{N_\varepsilon}},\quad \zeta_\varepsilon\overset{df}{=}W(1).$$

Let $\varepsilon>0$ be fixed; we construct the probability space $(\Omega^1,\mathcal{F}^1,P^1)$ in the following way: $\Omega^1=(\mathbb{R}^m)^{N_\varepsilon}\times C([0,1])$, $\mathcal{F}^1=\mathcal{B}(\Omega^1)$. Denote the coordinates of a point $\omega^1\in\Omega^1$ by $\chi=(\chi_1,\dots,\chi_{n_\varepsilon})\in(\mathbb{R}^m)^{N_\varepsilon},\varphi\in C([0,1])$. Define the following measures: $Q(du,dv)$ is the joint distribution of $(\eta_\varepsilon,\zeta_\varepsilon)$, $U_\varepsilon(d\chi,u)$ is the conditional distribution of $\{\xi_1,\dots,\xi_{N_\varepsilon}\}$ under condition $\{\frac{S_{N_\varepsilon}}{\sqrt{N_\varepsilon}}=u\}$, and $V_\varepsilon(d\varphi,v)$ is the conditional distribution of $W(\cdot)$ under condition $\{W(1)=v\}$. We put

$$P^1(A)=\int_{(\mathbb{R}^m)^2}\left[\int_A U_\varepsilon(d\chi,u)V_\varepsilon(d\varphi,v)\right]Q(du,dv),\quad A\in\mathcal{F}^1.$$

Now we define the probability space $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},P)$ as the infinite product of the copies of $(\Omega^1,\mathcal{F}^1,P^1)$. For $\omega=(\chi^1,\varphi^1,\chi^2,\varphi^2,\dots)\in\Omega$ define the sequence $\{\hat{\xi}_k(\omega),k\ge1\}$ by the formula

$$\hat{\xi}_1(\omega)=\chi^1_1,\ \hat{\xi}_2(\omega)=\chi^1_2,\ \dots,\ \hat{\xi}_{N_\varepsilon}(\omega)=\chi^1_{n_\varepsilon},\ \xi_{N_\varepsilon+1}(\omega)=\chi^2_1,\ \dots,$$

and the process $\{\hat{W}^n(t),t\in\mathbb{R}^+\}$ by the formula

$$\hat{W}^n(t)(\omega)=\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\left[\sum_{k=1}^{[nt]}\varphi^k(1)+\varphi^{[nt]+1}\Big(\frac{t-[nt]}{n}\Big)\right],\quad t\ge0.$$

By the construction, the sequence $\{\hat{\xi}_k\}$ has the same distribution with the sequence $\{\xi_k\}$ and the process $\hat{W}^n$ is a Brownian motion in $\mathbb{R}^m$. Now, let us define processes $\hat{X}_n,\hat{X}^n$ by the formulae (1.2),(1.3) and (1.1), with $\{\xi_k\}$ replaced by $\{\hat{\xi}_k\}$ and W replaced by $\hat{W}^n$; by the construction, the process $\hat{Y}_n=(\hat{X}_n,\hat{X}^n)$ satisfies the condition (i) of Definition 3.1.

Also, by the construction, the sets

$$\Xi^l_n=\left\{\hat{\xi}_{lN_\varepsilon+1},\dots,\hat{\xi}_{(l+1)N_\varepsilon},\left(\hat{W}^n(\cdot)-\hat{W}^n\left(\frac{lN_\varepsilon}{n}\right)\right)\Big|_{[\frac{lN_\varepsilon}{n},\frac{(l+1)N_\varepsilon}{n}]}\right\},\quad l=0,1,\dots$$

are mutually independent. According to (1.2),(1.3) and (1.1), the value of the process $\hat{Y}_n$ at the given time moment $\frac{iN_\varepsilon}{n},i\in\mathbb{N}$, is a functional of $\Xi^0_n,\dots,\Xi^{i-1}_n$, and the values of $\hat{Y}_n,\hat{X}_n$ or $\hat{X}^n$, at any time moment $t>\frac{iN_\varepsilon}{n}$, are a functionals of $\Xi^i_n,\Xi^{i+1}_n,\dots$ and $\hat{Y}_n\left(\frac{iN_\varepsilon}{n}\right),\hat{X}_n\left(\frac{iN_\varepsilon}{n}\right)$ or $\hat{X}^n\left(\frac{iN_\varepsilon}{n}\right)$, respectively. Thus, the processes $\hat{Y}_n,\hat{X}_n$ and $\hat{X}^n$ possess the Markov property w.r.t. filtration $\{\hat{\mathcal{F}}_t,t\in\mathbb{R}^+\}$, generated by $\hat{Y}_n$, at the time moments $\frac{iN_\varepsilon}{n},i\in\mathbb{N}$.

Let us proceed with the estimation of the distance between $\hat{X}_n$ and $\hat{X}^n$. In order to shorten exposition, we will give the estimate in the partial case $m = 1, a \equiv 0$; in general case, the argumentation is completely analogous, but the calculations take more place. Denote

$$t_i = \frac{iN_\varepsilon}{n}, \quad \Delta_{i,n} = \hat{X}_n(t_i) - \hat{X}_n(t_{i-1}) = \sum_{l=1}^{N_\varepsilon} b\left(\hat{X}_n\left(t_{i-1} + \frac{l-1}{n}\right)\right) \cdot \frac{\hat{\xi}_{(i-1)N_\varepsilon+l}}{\sqrt{n}},$$

$$\Delta_i^n = \hat{X}^n(t_i) - \hat{X}^n(t_{i-1}) = \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} b\left(\hat{X}^n(s)\right) dW^n(s), \quad i \in \mathbb{N}.$$

By the construction, $E[\Delta_{i,n}|\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{t_{i-1}}] = E[\Delta_i^n|\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{t_{i-1}}] = 0$, therefore,

$$E(\hat{X}_n(t_i) - \hat{X}^n(t_i))^2 = E(\hat{X}_n(t_{i-1}) - \hat{X}^n(t_{i-1}))^2 + E(\Delta_{i,n} - \Delta_i^n)^2, \quad i \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{3.3}$$

We write the decomposition

$$\Delta_{i,n} = b\left(\hat{X}_n\left(t_{i-1}\right)\right) \cdot \sum_{l=1}^{N_\varepsilon} \frac{\hat{\xi}_{(i-1)N_\varepsilon+l}}{\sqrt{n}} + \Gamma_{i,n},$$

$$\Gamma_{i,n} \equiv \sum_{l=1}^{N_\varepsilon} \left[b\left(\hat{X}_n\left(t_{i-1} + \frac{l-1}{n}\right)\right) - b\left(\hat{X}_n\left(t_{i-1}\right)\right)\right] \cdot \frac{\hat{\xi}_{(i-1)N_\varepsilon+l}}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

The pair of the processes $(\{\hat{X}_n(t), t \in \mathbb{R}^+\}, \{\hat{\xi}_k, k \in \mathbb{N}\})$ has the same distribution with the pair $(\{X_n(t), t \in \mathbb{R}^+\}, \{\xi_k, k \in \mathbb{N}\})$. Thus, for every $k \geq 1$, the random variable $\hat{\xi}_k$ does not depend on the values of the process $\hat{X}_n$ on the interval $[0, \frac{k-1}{n}]$. Using this, and taking into account that the function b is bounded by a constant B and satisfies the Lipschitz condition with a constant L, we get the estimate

$$E\Gamma_{i,n}^2 \leq \frac{L^2}{n} \sum_{l=1}^{N_\varepsilon} E\left[\hat{X}_n\left(t_{i-1} + \frac{l-1}{n}\right) - \hat{X}_n\left(t_{i-1}\right)\right]^2 \leq \frac{L^2}{n} \sum_{l=1}^{N_\varepsilon} B^2 \cdot \frac{l-1}{n} < \frac{L^2 B^2 N_\varepsilon^2}{2n^2}. \tag{3.4}$$

Let us also write the decomposition

$$\Delta_i^n = b\left(\hat{X}^n\left(t_{i-1}\right)\right) \cdot \left[\hat{W}^n(t_i) - \hat{W}^n(t_{i-1})\right] + \Gamma_i^n,$$

where the second summand (we do not write it explicitly) can be estimated analogously to (3.4):

$$E\left[\Gamma_i^n\right]^2 \leq \frac{L^2 B^2 N_\varepsilon^2}{2n^2}. \tag{3.5}$$

At last, we write the decomposition

$$b\left(\hat{X}_n\left(t_{i-1}\right)\right) \cdot \sum_{l=1}^{N_\varepsilon} \frac{\hat{\xi}_{(i-1)N_\varepsilon+l}}{\sqrt{n}} - b\left(\hat{X}^n\left(t_{i-1}\right)\right) \cdot \left[\hat{W}^n(t_i) - \hat{W}^n(t_{i-1})\right] =$$

$$= \left[b\left(\hat{X}_n\left(t_{i-1}\right)\right) - b\left(\hat{X}^n\left(t_{i-1}\right)\right)\right] \cdot \left[\hat{W}^n(t_i) - \hat{W}^n(t_{i-1})\right] + \sqrt{\frac{N_\varepsilon}{n}} \cdot b\left(\hat{X}_n\left(t_{i-1}\right)\right) \cdot \Upsilon_n^i,$$

where $\Upsilon_n^i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N_\varepsilon}}\sum_{l=1}^{N_\varepsilon}\hat{\xi}_{(i-1)N_\varepsilon+l} - [t_i - t_{i-1}]^{-\frac{1}{2}}\Big[\hat{W}^n(t_i) - \hat{W}^n(t_{i-1})\Big]$. By the construction, for every $i \geq 1$, the random variables $\Big[\hat{W}^n(t_i) - \hat{W}^n(t_{i-1})\Big]$ and Υ_n^i do not depend on the values of the process $\hat{Y}_n$ on the interval $[0, \frac{(i-1)\varepsilon}{n}]$. Moreover, $E[\Upsilon_n^i]^2 < \varepsilon$. Therefore, the following estimates hold true

$$E\left[b\left(\hat{X}_n\left(t_{i-1}\right)\right) - b\left(\hat{X}^n\left(t_{i-1}\right)\right)\right]^2\left[\hat{W}^n(t_i) - \hat{W}^n(t_{i-1})\right]^2 \leq \frac{L^2 N_\varepsilon}{n}E(\hat{X}_n(t_{i-1}) - \hat{X}^n(t_{i-1}))^2, \tag{3.6}$$

$$E\left[b\left(\hat{X}_n\left(t_{i-1}\right)\right)\cdot\Upsilon_n^i\right]^2 \leq B^2\varepsilon^2. \tag{3.7}$$

Now, using the decomposition (3.3), the Cauchy inequality $(\sum_{k\leq 4}x_k)^2 \leq 4\sum_{k\leq 4}x_k^2$ and the estimates (3.4)–(3.7), we obtain

$$E(\hat{X}_n(t_i) - \hat{X}^n(t_i))^2 \leq \left(1 + \frac{4L^2N_\varepsilon}{n}\right)E(\hat{X}_n(t_{i-1}) - \hat{X}^n(t_{i-1}))^2 + \frac{4L^2B^2N_\varepsilon^2}{n^2} + \frac{4B^2\varepsilon N_\varepsilon}{n}. \tag{3.8}$$

Iterating (3.8), we obtain

$$E(\hat{X}_n(t_i) - \hat{X}^n(t_i))^2 \leq \left[\frac{4L^2B^2N_\varepsilon}{n} + 4B^2\varepsilon\right]\cdot\frac{N_\varepsilon}{n}\cdot\sum_{j\leq i}\left(1 + \frac{4L^2N_\varepsilon}{n}\right)^j. \tag{3.9}$$

Let $t_i \leq T$, that means that $i \leq \frac{Tn}{N_\varepsilon}$. Then the sum in the right hand side of (3.9) contains at most $\frac{Tn}{N_\varepsilon}$ summands, and every summand is not greater than $\exp\left[\frac{4L^2N_\varepsilon}{n}\cdot\frac{Tn}{N_\varepsilon}\right] = e^{4L^2T}$. This provides the estimate

$$E(\hat{X}_n(t_i) - \hat{X}^n(t_i))^2 \leq \left[\frac{4L^2B^2N_\varepsilon T}{n} + 4B^2T\varepsilon\right]\cdot e^{4L^2T}. \tag{3.10}$$

The sequence $\{(\hat{X}_n(t_i) - \hat{X}^n(t_i)), i \in \mathbb{N}\}$, by the construction, is a martingale, thus, using the maximal martingale inequality ([17], Ch. VII, §3), we obtain the estimate

$$P\left[\max_{i:t_i\leq T}(\hat{X}_n(t_i) - \hat{X}^n(t_i))^2 \geq \gamma^2\right] \leq \gamma^{-2}\left[\frac{4L^2B^2N_\varepsilon T}{n} + 4B^2T\varepsilon\right]\cdot e^{4L^2T}, \quad \gamma > 0. \tag{3.11}$$

Now we can complete the proof of the Lemma. For a given γ, T choose $\varepsilon > 0$ in such a way that

$$16B^2T\cdot e^{4L^2T}\cdot\varepsilon < \gamma^3,$$

and proceed with the construction, described above, with this ε. We have already seen that, under this construction, conditions (i) and (ii) hold true with $K(\gamma, T) = N_\varepsilon$. The estimate (3.11) provides that the condition (iii) holds true with the same $K(\gamma, T)$. The lemma is proved.

Remark 3.1. Denote by $\mathbf{K}(\gamma, T)$ the minimum of the set of such numbers $K \in \mathbb{N}$, that here exists a process $\hat{Y}_n$, satisfying conditions (i) – (iii) of Definition 3.1 with $K(\gamma, T) = K$. In the paper [16], it is shown (the part II of Theorem 1) that, in the basic case $a \equiv 0, b \equiv I_{\mathbb{R}^m}$,

$$\sup_{\gamma>0}\mathbf{K}(\gamma, T) = +\infty$$

as soon as the distribution of ξ_1 differs from the normal one. One can say that, while the accuracy of the approximation becomes better (the accuracy is described by the parameter γ), the Markov properties of the two-component process necessarily become worse (these properties are described by $\mathbf{K}(\gamma, T)$).

4. THE PROOFS OF THEOREM 2.1 AND PROPOSITION 1.1

We reduce the proof of Theorem 2.1 to the verification of the conditions of Theorem 3.1. The sequence X_n provides the Markov approximation for the process X due to Lemma 3.1. Condition 1 of Theorem 3.1 holds true due to condition A4). Let us check that the conditions 2 and 3 hold true. The characteristics f^t of the functional $\varphi^{s,t} = \int_s^t \frac{d\mu}{d\lambda^m}(X(r))\,dr$ has the form

$$f^t(x) = \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} p_r(x,y)\mu(dy)\,dr, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^m, t \geq 0,$$

where $\{p_t(x,y), t \geq 0, x, y \in \mathbb{R}^m\}$ is the transition probability density for the process X. Existence of such a density under condition A1) is a standard result of the theory of parabolic equations. Moreover, this density possesses the following properties (see, for instance, Appendix to [2],§6, and references there).

B1) The function $p : (t,x,y) \mapsto p_t(x,y)$ is uniformly continuous on $[\delta, T] \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^m$ for every $0 < \delta < T$.

B2) There exist a constants $M, \alpha > 0$ such that

$$p_t(x,y) \leq M t^{-\frac{m}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha \|y-x\|^2}{t}\right).$$

B3) There exist a constants $M_1, M_2, \alpha, \beta, \lambda > 0$ such that

$$p_t(x,y) \geq M_1 t^{-\frac{m}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha \|y-x\|^2}{t}\right) - M_2 t^{-\frac{m}{2}+\lambda} \exp\left(-\frac{\beta \|y-x\|^2}{t}\right).$$

Under conditions A2),A3), the processes X_n possess the transition probability densities $p^n_t(x,y)$ at the time moments $t \in \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{N}$, that means that

$$P(X_n(t) \in \Gamma | X_n(s) = x) = \int_\Gamma p^n_{t-s}(x,y)\,dy, \quad s,t \in \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{Z}, s < t, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^m, \Gamma \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{R}^m),$$

and, moreover, for every $t \in \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{N}$, the function p^n_t is a continuous one. The characteristics f_n of the functionals φ_n can be expressed through these densities by the formula

$$f_n^{s,t}(x) = \frac{1}{n}F_n(x) + \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}, \frac{k}{n}<t-s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} F_n(y) p^n_{\frac{k}{n}}(x,y)\,dy = f_n^{0,t-s}(x), \quad s \leq t, x \in \mathbb{R}^m. \tag{4.1}$$

Below, we denote $f_n^{0,t} = f_n^t$. Theorem 2.1 [13] and Theorem 1 [14] imply that, under conditions A1) – A3), the following estimate for the deviation of the densities p^n_t from the limiting density p_t holds true.

B4) For any $T \in \mathbb{R}^+$,

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}, t\leq T} \sup_{x,y\in\mathbb{R}^m} \sqrt{n} \cdot t^{-\frac{m}{2}} \cdot \left(1 + \left(\frac{\|y-x\|}{\sqrt{t}}\right)^m\right) \cdot |p_t(x,y) - p^n_t(x,y)| < +\infty.$$

Denote, for $\delta > 0$,

$$f^t_\delta(x) = f^t(x) - f^{\delta\wedge t}(x) = \int_{\delta\wedge t}^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} p_r(x,y)\mu(dy)\,dr, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^m, t \geq 0,$$

$$f^t_{n,\delta}(x) = f^t_n(x) - f^{\delta\wedge t}_n(x) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N},\delta\le\frac{k}{n}<t}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} F_n(y)p^n_{\frac{k}{n}}(x,y)\,dy, \quad s\le t, x\in\mathbb{R}^m.$$

Conditions A4), A5) and properties B1),B2),B4) imply the following statement.

Proposition 4.1. *For any $\delta>0$,*

(i) the function $f_\delta : (t,x)\mapsto f^t_\delta(x)$ is uniformly continuous on $[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^m$;

(ii) the functions $f_{\delta,n} : (t,x)\mapsto f^t_{n,\delta}(x)$ converge, as $n\to\infty$, to the function f_δ uniformly on $[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^m$.

The proof of Proposition 4.1 is quite standard and we omit it here (see, for instance, the arguments given in the proof of Theorem 3 [15]). It follows from Proposition 4.1 that, in order to prove that the conditions 2 and 3 of Theorem 3.1 hold true (and therefore, to prove the Theorem 2.1), it is sufficient to prove the following two relations:

$$\lim_{\delta\downarrow 0}\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^m} f^\delta(x) = 0, \tag{4.2}$$

$$\lim_{\delta\downarrow 0}\limsup_{n\to+\infty}\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^m} f^\delta_n(x) = 0. \tag{4.3}$$

Let us prove (4.3). In the exposition below, we suppose that $\delta\le 1$. It follows from B2),B4) that, for any $T\in\mathbb{R}^+$, there exists a constant $C_T\in\mathbb{R}^+$ such that

$$p^n_t(x,y)\le C_T\cdot t^{-\frac{m}{2}}\left[\exp\left(-\frac{\alpha\|y-x\|^2}{t}\right)+\left(1+\left(\frac{\|y-x\|}{\sqrt{t}}\right)^m\right)^{-1}\right], \quad t\in\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{N}, t\le T, n\in\mathbb{N}.$$

Then the formula (4.1) implies the estimate

$$\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^m} f^\delta_n(x)\le\frac{1}{n}\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^m}F_n(x)+\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^m}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}K_{n,\delta}(\|y-x\|)\mu_n(dy), \tag{4.4}$$

where

$$K_{n,\delta}(z)=\frac{C_1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{[n\delta]}\left(\frac{n}{k}\right)^{\frac{m}{2}}\cdot\left[\exp\left(-\alpha z^2\cdot\frac{n}{k}\right)+\left(1+\left(z\cdot\sqrt{\frac{n}{k}}\right)^m\right)^{-1}\right], \quad z\in\mathbb{R}^+.$$

For any $k\in\mathbb{N}$ and any $t\in\left[\frac{k}{n},\frac{k+1}{n}\right]$, the following inequalities hold true:

$$\left(\frac{n}{k}\right)^{\frac{m}{2}}\le\left(\frac{k+1}{k}\right)^{\frac{m}{2}}\cdot t^{-\frac{m}{2}}\le 2^{\frac{m}{2}}\cdot t^{-\frac{m}{2}},$$

$$\exp\left(-\alpha z^2\cdot\frac{n}{k}\right)+\left(1+\left(z\cdot\sqrt{\frac{n}{k}}\right)^m\right)^{-1}\le\exp\left(-\frac{\alpha z^2}{t}\right)+\left(1+\left(\frac{z}{\sqrt{t}}\right)^m\right)^{-1},$$

and therefore, for any $k\in\mathbb{N}$,

$$\frac{1}{n}\left(\frac{n}{k}\right)^{\frac{m}{2}}\cdot\left[\exp\left(-\alpha z^2\cdot\frac{n}{k}\right)+\left(1+\left(z\cdot\sqrt{\frac{n}{k}}\right)^m\right)^{-1}\right]\le$$

$$\le 2^{\frac{m}{2}}\cdot\int_{\frac{k}{n}}^{\frac{k+1}{n}} t^{-\frac{m}{2}}\cdot\left[\exp\left(-\frac{\alpha z^2}{t}\right)+\left(1+\left(\frac{z}{\sqrt{t}}\right)^m\right)^{-1}\right]dt. \tag{4.5}$$

The estimate (4.5) implies the following estimate for the kernel $K_{n,\delta}$:

$$K_{n,\delta}(z) \le 2^{\frac{m}{2}} C_1 \cdot \int_{\frac{1}{n}}^{\delta} t^{-\frac{m}{2}} \cdot \left[\exp\left(-\frac{\alpha z^2}{t}\right) + \left(1 + \left(\frac{z}{\sqrt{t}}\right)^m\right)^{-1} \right] dt \le$$

$$\le K_\delta(z) \equiv 2^{\frac{m}{2}} C_1 \cdot \int_0^{\delta} t^{-\frac{m}{2}} \cdot \left[\exp\left(-\frac{\alpha z^2}{t}\right) + \left(1 + \left(\frac{z}{\sqrt{t}}\right)^m\right)^{-1} \right] dt$$

We estimate the kernel K_δ using the calculations, analogous to those made in [2], §6.1. Making the change of variables $u = \frac{z^2}{t}$, we get the formula

$$K_\delta(z) = 2^{\frac{m}{2}} C_1 \cdot z^{2-m} \cdot G\left(\frac{z^2}{\delta}\right), \quad G(y) = \int_y^\infty u^{\frac{m}{2}-2} \left[\exp(-\alpha u) + \left(1 + u^{\frac{m}{2}}\right)^{-1} \right] du. \tag{4.6}$$

The following properties of the function G can be verified straightforwardly:

$$G(y) \to 0, \quad y \to +\infty, \quad \begin{cases} G(\cdot) \text{ is bounded}, & m > 2 \\ G(y) \sim -2\ln y,\ y \to 0+, & m = 2 \end{cases}. \tag{4.7}$$

Let us give two estimates. First,

$$K_\delta(z) \le D \cdot w(z) \cdot G(\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}), \quad z > \delta^{\frac{1}{4}} \tag{4.8}$$

(here and below we denote by D a positive constant such that its explicit value in not needed for us; the concrete values of D may vary from line to line). For $m > 2$, this estimate follows immediately form the representation (4.6); for $m = 2$, one should recall additionally that (for $m = 2$) $w(z) \ge 1$. Second,

$$K_\delta(z) \le D w(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^+. \tag{4.9}$$

For $m = 3$ this estimate holds true since the function G is bounded, for $m = 2$ it holds true due to the estimates

$$G(y) \le D \cdot w(y), \quad G\left(\frac{z^2}{\delta}\right) \le D \cdot w\left(\frac{z^2}{\delta}\right) \le D \cdot w(z^2) \le 2D \cdot w(z)$$

(we used here that $\delta < 1$). The formula (4.4), condition A4) and estimates (4.8),(4.9) imply

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^m} f_n^\delta(x) \le D \cdot G(\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \cdot \limsup_{n\to+\infty} \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^m} \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} w(\|y-x\|)\mu_n(dy) +$$

$$+ D \cdot \limsup_{n\to+\infty} \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^m} \int_{\|y-x\|<\delta^{\frac{1}{4}}} w(\|y-x\|)\mu_n(dy). \tag{4.10}$$

Both summands in the right hand side of the inequality (4.10) tend to zero as $\delta \downarrow 0$. This follows from (4.7), Remark 2.2 and condition A6). Thus, the relation (4.3) is proved. The proof of the relation (4.2) is completely analogous and we omit it here.

We have verified that the processes X_n, X and the functionals φ_n, defined by (1.1) – (1.4), under conditions A1) – A6), satisfy all the conditions of Theorem 3.1. Using this theorem, we obtain the statement of Theorem 2.1.

The proof of Proposition 1.1. The family $\{f^\delta\}$ is monotonous w.r.t. δ. Therefore, the implication (i)⇒(ii) follows form the Dini's Theorem and the fact that, due to compactness of the support of μ and the property B2), for any given $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$,

$$f^t(x) \to 0, \quad \|x\| \to +\infty.$$

The uniform limit of a uniformly continuous functions is a uniformly continuous function; this, together with Proposition 4.1, provides the implication (ii)⇒(i). The implication (iii)⇒(ii) is contained in the relation (4.2). In order to prove the inverse implication, we use the property B3) and calculations, analogous to those made above. We write

$$f^\delta(x) \ge \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} R_\delta(\|y-x\|)\mu(dy), \quad R_\delta(z) \equiv \int_0^\delta \left[M_1 t^{-\frac{m}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha z^2}{t}\right) - M_2 t^{-\frac{m}{2}+\lambda} \exp\left(-\frac{\beta z^2}{t}\right)\right] dt.$$

Making the change of the variables $u = \frac{z^2}{t}$, we get

$$R_\delta(z) = z^{2-m} G_1\left(\frac{z^2}{\delta}\right) - z^{2-m+2\lambda} G_2\left(\frac{z^2}{\delta}\right),$$

$$G_1(y) \equiv M_1 \int_y^\infty u^{\frac{m}{2}-2} \exp[-\alpha u]\, du, \quad G_2(y) \equiv M_2 \int_y^\infty u^{\frac{m}{2}-2-\lambda} \exp[-\beta u]\, du.$$

Without losing generality, we can suppose that $\lambda < 1$. Let us consider two cases. If $m \ge 3$, then the functions G_1, G_2 are bounded, and, for $z < \delta$,

$$R_\delta(z) \ge z^{2-m} \cdot [G_1(\delta) - \delta^{2\lambda} G_2(\delta)] \ge w(z) \cdot D$$

with δ small enough. Thus, for small enough δ,

$$f^\delta(x) \ge D \int_{\|y-x\| \le \delta} w(\|y-x\|)\, \mu(dy). \tag{4.11}$$

If $m = 2$, then $G_1(y) \sim -\ln y, y \downarrow 0$, and therefore, for small enough δ and $z < \delta$,

$$G_1\left(\frac{z^2}{\delta}\right) \ge D \ln \frac{\delta}{z^2} \ge D \ln \frac{1}{z} = Dw(z).$$

Next, $G_2(y) \sim \frac{1}{\lambda} y^{-\lambda}, y \downarrow 0$, and thus, for small enough δ and $z < \delta$,

$$z^{2\lambda} G_2\left(\frac{z^2}{\delta}\right) \le D z^{2\lambda} \left(\frac{\delta}{z^2}\right)^\lambda = D\delta^\lambda.$$

The two latter estimates and the fact that $w(\cdot) \ge 1$ for $m = 2$ provide that the estimate (4.11) holds true in the case $m = 2$, also. This estimate proves the implication (ii)⇒(iii). The proposition is proved.

5. EXAMPLES

In order to illustrate the domain of application of Theorem 2.1, we give two examples. In our first example, we construct the measure μ, satisfying condition (1.12), but not satisfying (1.10). The W-functional, that corresponds to this measure, can not occur as a limiting one in the framework of the paper [11]; on the other hand, this functional belongs to the class of the limiting functionals, obtained via Theorem 2.1 (see Remark 2.3).

Example 5.1. Let $m=2$, $\{r_k,k\ge 1\}$ be a sequence of positive numbers (it will be defined precisely later on), and the measure μ to have the form $\mu=\sum_{k\ge 1}Q_k\cdot\mu_k$, where $\{Q_k,k\ge 1\}$ is a certain weight sequence and $\mu_k=\delta_{S_k}$ is the surface measure on the circle $S_k\equiv\{y|\|y\|=r_k\},k\ge 1$ (the measures μ_k are normalized in such a way that $\mu_k(S_k)=1,k\ge 1$).

For any $x\in\mathbb{R}^2,\delta\in(0,e^{-1})$, denote $B(x,\delta)=\{y|\|y-x\|\le\delta\}$, then

$$\int_{\|y-x\|\le\delta}w(\|y-x\|)\mu(dy)=\sum_k Q_k\cdot V_k^\delta(x),\quad V_k^\delta(\cdot)\equiv\int_{S_k\cap B(x,\delta)}w(\|y-\cdot\|)\,\mu_k(dy).$$

Note that, up to a term $\frac{1}{2\pi}$, V_k^δ is the simple layer potential, generated by the measure $\mathbb{1}_{B(x,\delta)}d\mu_k$, concentrated on S_k (see, for instance, [18], §21). This potential is dominated by the potential V_k generated by the measure μ_k, and both these potentials are a continuous functions, harmonic in both $\{y|\|y\|<r_k\}$ and $\{y|\|y\|>r_k\}$. The maximum principle provides that

$$V_k(z)=V_k(0)=\ln\left(\frac{1}{r_k}\right),\ \|z\|\le r_k,\quad V_k^\delta(x)\le V_k(x)\le\ln\left(\frac{1}{r_k}\right),\ x\in\mathbb{R}^2,\delta\in(0,e^{-1}),\quad k\ge 1. \tag{5.1}$$

Due to the maximum principle, V_k^δ takes its maximum value on the circle S_k. If $\delta<r_k$, then $S_k\cap B(x,\delta)$ is the arch on the circle S_k, and it is easy to verify that the corresponding maximal value is taken at the middle of this arch. This reasoning and the straightforward calculation, that is easy and omitted, give the estimate

$$V_k^\delta(x)\le D\cdot\left(\frac{\delta}{r_k}\right)\cdot\ln\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right). \tag{5.2}$$

Now, we put $r_k=2^{-k^2},Q_k=k^{-4},k\ge 1$. Let $\delta\in(0,e^{-1})$ be fixed and $x\in\mathbb{R}^m$ be arbitrary, let us estimate $\int_{\|y-x\|\le\delta}w(\|y-x\|)\mu(dy)$. For $\|x\|\le 2\delta$, we have $B(x,\delta)\subset B(0,3\delta)$, an therefore, due to (5.1),

$$\int_{\|y-x\|\le\delta}w(\|y-x\|)\mu(dy)\le\sum_{k:r_k\le 3\delta}Q_k\ln\left(\frac{1}{r_k}\right)=\sum_{k:r_k\le 3\delta}\frac{1}{k^2}\le D\cdot\left[\ln\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right]^{-\frac12}. \tag{5.3}$$

If $\|x\|>2\delta$, then there exists at most one value $k=k_*$ such that $B(x,\delta)\cap S_{k_*}\ne\emptyset$, it being known that $r_{k_*}\ge\delta$. Then, due to (5.1),(5.2),

$$\int_{\|y-x\|\le\delta}w(\|y-x\|)\mu(dy)\le D\cdot\sup_{k:r_k\ge\delta}[\ln r_k]^{-2}\cdot\left(\frac{\delta}{r_k}\right)\cdot\ln\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)=D\cdot\sup_{k:r_k\ge\delta}\frac{\Phi(\delta)}{\Phi(r_k)}\cdot\left[\ln\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right]^{-1}, \tag{5.4}$$

where the function $\Phi(t)=t[\ln t]^2,t\ge 0$ is non-decreasing in some neighborhood of zero. From (5.3),(5.4), the estimate

$$\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^m}\int_{\|y-x\|\le\delta}w(\|y-x\|)\mu(dy)\le D\cdot\left[\ln\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right]^{-\frac12},$$

follows, that provides (1.12). On the other hand,

$$\mu(B(0,r_k))>Q_k=\left(\frac{1}{\ln r_k}\right)^2,$$

and thus, for every $\gamma > 0$,

$$\limsup_{r\downarrow 0} r^{-\gamma}\mu(B(0,r)) = +\infty,$$

that means that condition (1.10) does not hold true.

In the second example, we construct a W-measure μ, that does not satisfy condition (1.12); the W-functional, corresponding to this measure, can not be obtained in Theorem 2.1 as a limiting one.

Example 5.2. Let $m = 2$, we put $r_k = 2^{-k^2}, a_k = (\frac{1}{k}, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $\tilde{S}_k = \{y | \|y - a_k\| = r_k\}, \tilde{Q}_k = k^{-2}, k \geq 1$, $\tilde{\mu}_k = \delta_{\tilde{S}_k}$ is the surface measure on the circle $\tilde{S}_k$, normalized in such a way that $\tilde{\mu}_k(\tilde{S}_k) = 1, k \geq 1$. We put

$$\tilde{\mu} = \sum_k \tilde{Q}_k \tilde{\mu}_k,$$

and show that $\tilde{\mu}$ is a W-measure that does not satisfy (1.12). By the construction, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$, the relation

$$\|x - a_k\| \leq 2^{-\sqrt{k}} \tag{5.5}$$

holds true for at most N values $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Furthermore, if $k > 4$ and (5.5) holds true, then $\|y - x\| \leq e^{-1}, y \in \tilde{S}_k$. Therefore, for a given $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$, for such $k > 4$ that (5.5) holds true, using the maximum principle we obtain the estimate

$$\tilde{Q}_k \cdot \int_{\|y-x\|\leq 1} w(\|y - x\|)\tilde{\mu}_k(dy) \leq \tilde{Q}_k \cdot \int_{\tilde{S}_k} \ln\left(\frac{1}{\|y - a_k\|}\right) \tilde{\mu}_k(dy) = \tilde{Q}_k \cdot \ln\left(\frac{1}{r_k}\right) = \tilde{Q}_k \cdot k^2 = 1.$$

If $k > 1$ and (5.5) fails, then $\|y - x\| \geq 2^{-\sqrt{k}-1}, y \in \tilde{S}_k$. Thus, for a given $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$, for $k > 2$ such that (5.5) fails, we have the estimate

$$\tilde{Q}_k \cdot \int_{\|y-x\|\leq 1} w(\|y - x\|)\tilde{\mu}_k(dy) \leq \tilde{Q}_k \cdot (\sqrt{k} + 1) = k^{-\frac{3}{2}} + k^{-2}.$$

Furthermore, every measure $\tilde{\mu}_k$ is a W-measure, and thus

$$\sigma_k \equiv \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^m} \int_{\|y-x\|\leq 1} w(\|y - x\|)\tilde{\mu}_k(dy) < +\infty, \quad k \geq 1.$$

The three latter estimates imply that

$$\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^m} \int_{\|y-x\|\leq 1} w(\|y - x\|)\tilde{\mu}(dy) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{4} k^{-2}\sigma_k + N + \sum_{k\geq 5}(k^{-\frac{3}{2}} + k^{-2}) < +\infty,$$

that means that $\tilde{\mu}$ is a W-measure. On the other hand, for $\delta_k = r_k, x_k = a_k$ we have that

$$\int_{\|y-x_k\|\leq\delta_k} w(\|y - x_k\|)\tilde{\mu}(dy) \geq \tilde{Q}_k \cdot \int_{\|y-x_k\|\leq\delta_k} w(\|y - x_k\|)\tilde{\mu}_k(dy) = 1$$

and $\delta_k \to 0, k \to \infty$. This means that, for $\tilde{\mu}$, condition (1.12) fails.

References

[1] A.V.Skorokhod, *Asymptotic methods in the theory of stochastic differential equations* , Kiev: Naukova dumka, 1987 (in Russian).

[2] E.B.Dynkin, *Markov processes,* M.: Fizmatgiz, 1963 (in Russian).

[3] A.V.Skorokhod, N.P.Slobodeniuk, *Limit theorems for random walks*, Kiev: Naukova dumka, 1970 (in Russian).

[4] A.N.Borodin, I.A.Ibragimov, *Limit theorems for functionals of random walks*, Proc. of Steklov Math. Institute RAC, **195**, Saint-Pt.: Nauka, 1994 (in Russian).

[5] I.I.Gikhman, *Some limit theorems for the number of intersections of the boudary of the domain by a random function*, Sci. Notes of Kiev Univ., **16** (1957), N10, p. 149 – 164 (in Ukrainian).

[6] I.I.Gikhman, *Asymptotic distributions for the number of intersections of the boudary of the domain by a random function*, Visnyk Kiev Univ., Ser. Astronomy, Mathematisc and Mechanics, **1** (1958), N1, p. 25 – 46 (in Ukrainian).

[7] N.I.Portenko, *Integral equations and limit theorems for additive functionals of Markov processes*, Theor. Prob. and Applic., **12** (1967), N3, p. 551 – 558 (in Russian).

[8] A.N.Borodin, *On the asymptotic behavior of local times of recurrent random walks with finite variance*, Theor. Prob. and Applic., **26** (1981), c. 758 – 772.

[9] E.Perkins, *Weak invariance principles for local time*, Z. f. Wahrschein., **60** (1982), p. 437 – 451.

[10] A.S.Cherny, A.N.Shiryaev, M.Yor, *Limit behavior of the "horizontal-vertical" random walk and some extensions of the Donsker-Prokhorov invariance principle,* Theor. Prob. and Applic., **47** (2002), N3, p. 498 – 517.

[11] R.F.Bass, D.Khoshnevisan, *Local times on curves and uniform invariance principles*, Prob. Theory Rel. Fields, **92** (1992), p. 465 – 492.

[12] E.B.Dynkin, *Self-intersection gauge for random walks for Brownian motion*, Ann. Probab. **16** (1988), p. 1 – 57.

[13] V.Konakov, E.Mammen, *Local limit theorems for transition densities of Markov chains converging to diffusions*, Prob.Theory Rel. Fields, **117** (2000), p. 551 – 587.

[14] V.Konakov, *Small time asymptotics in local limit theorems for Markov chains converging to diffusions*, 2006, arxiv:math. PR/0602429.

[15] Yu.N.Kartashov, A.M.Kulik, *Invariance principle for additive functionals of Markov chains*, 2006, submitted (in Russian, english translation is available at arXiv:0704.0508).

[16] A.M.Kulik, Markov approximation of stable processes by random walks, Theory of stochastic proccesses, **12(28)** (2006), N1-2, p. 87 – 93.

[17] J.L.Doob, *Stochastic processes*, M.:IL, 1956 (Russian, translated from J.L.Doob, Stochastic processes, NY, Wiley, 1953).

[18] V.S.Vladimirov, *Equations of mathematical physics*, M.: Nauka, 1967 (in Russian).

Institute of Mathematics, Ukrainian National Academy of Sciences, 3, Tereshchenkivska Str., Kyiv 01601, Ukraine

E-mail address: `kulik@imath.kiev.ua`